

**REMARKS**

In paragraph 1 of the final rejection, it is stated that there is no claim that covers any switching. This is incorrect. This limitation is contained in claim 17 which calls for "programmably change the assignment of programs to said ports." Similarly, claim 3 calls for a digital interface that includes a plurality of programmable ports so that connections from the digital interface to the digital-to-analog converters may be changed. Claims 7 and 8 cover a related arrangement and claim 10 is comparable.

In rejecting claim 3, it is simply argued that Shuholm teaches a digital interface with a plurality of programmable ports. However, this reference is not a digital interface as suggested in paragraph 3 of the office action. It is a digital audio receiver that receives multiplexed channels and can output those multiplexed channels. It allows the user to swap channels 1 and 3, leaving channels 2 and 4 where they are. This has no reasonable relationship whatsoever to the claimed invention. In effect, what has been done is simply to pull a reference which has no bearing whatsoever but simply teaches switching and then suggesting that somehow the reference teaches a solution to an unrelated problem just because it teaches unrelated switching.


The present application calls for mixing, which is nowhere discussed in Shuholm. While switching may be known, switching mixed outputs as claimed is nowhere suggested in the reference. The fact that multiplexed channels might be switched has no suggestion to one of skill in the art why one would want to switch mixers on the fly. For example, if a mixer is receiving a stream which is going to a digital recording device and the second mixer is receiving a stream which is being played real time, a single codec can handle both streams, switching the outputs on the fly.

The cited reference is not a digital interface, it does not involve analog mixers, and it does not involve digital to analog converters, as claimed. It is so remote that it has no reasonable relationship. The fact that the channels could be switched does not provide a rationale to switch mixer outputs.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2006



---

Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation